arXiv:1408.1442v1 [math.OC] 6 Aug 2014

A Generalized result of Output Stabilizability

Faouzi Haddouchi

Department of Physics, University of Sciences and Technology
El M'naouar, BP 1505, Oran, 31000, Algeria
fhaddouchi@gmail.com

Abstract

Output stabilizability of a class of infinite dimensional linear systems is studied in this paper. A criterion for the system to be output stabilizable by a linear bounded feedback $u = Fx$, $F \in L(Z, \mathbb{R}^p)$ will be given.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 93D15, 93C25

Keywords: Infinite dimensional systems, controllability, state stabilizability, output stabilizability

1 Introduction

In this note, inspired by the result in [2] for output stabilizability of the diffusion equation, we proposed a new output stabilizability criterion for a class of infinite dimensional linear systems with multi-actuators and multi-sensors. The system we consider is described by the abstract differential equation

$$(\mathcal{S}) \begin{cases} \dot{x} = Ax + Bu \\ x(0) = x_0 \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where A generates a strongly continuous semigroup $(S(t))_{t\geq 0}$ on Z (state space); U is the control space and the control function $u(.) \in L^2(0, T; U)$; $B \in L(U, Z)$; U and Z are supposed to be a separable Hilbert spaces. The system (1) is augmented by the output equation

$$(\mathcal{E}) \quad y = Cx \tag{2}$$

where $C \in L(Z, Y)$, Y is the observation (output) space, a separable Hilbert space, $y(.) \in L^2(0, T; Y)$.

The system we shall characterize its output stabilizability is assumed to be controlled via p actuators $(\Omega_i, g_i)_{1\leq i\leq p}$ and takes the form

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial t}(\xi,t) = \Delta z + kz + \sum_{i=1}^{p} g_i(\xi)u_i(t) \quad in\ \Omega\times(0,T), \tag{3}$$

with boundary conditions

$$z(\xi,t) = 0 \ \ in\ \partial\Omega\times(0,T), \tag{4}$$

and the initial condition

$$z(\xi,0) = z_0(\xi) \ \ in\ \Omega, \tag{5}$$

with the output function given by

$$y(t) = \begin{bmatrix} y_1(t) \\ . \\ . \\ y_q(t) \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

where

$$y_i(t) = \int_{D_i} f_i(\xi)z(\xi,t)d\xi, \tag{7}$$

and Δ is the Laplacian operator, Ω is bounded and open in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $g_i \in L^2(\Omega_i)$, $\Omega_i \subset \Omega$, $\Omega_i \cap \Omega_j = \emptyset$, $k > 0$ and $(D_i, f_i)_{1\leq i\leq\ q}$ is a suite of sensors with $D_i \subset \Omega$ and $f_i \in L^2(D_i)$.
The above system (3)-(7) is a special form of (1)-(2) where $Z = L^2(\Omega)$, $A = \Delta + kI$, $D(A) = H_0^1(\Omega)\cap H^2(\Omega)$ and

$$B\begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ . \\ . \\ u_p \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^{p} g_i u_i. \tag{8}$$

Clearly the output function (6) may be written in the form

$$y(t) = Cx(t). \tag{9}$$

If the associated eigenfunctions are φ_{nj} then

$$S(t)x = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp(\mu_n t)\sum_{j=1}^{r_n}\langle x, \varphi_{nj}\rangle\varphi_{nj} \tag{10}$$

where r_n is the multiplicity of the eigenvalue μ_n .

In this work the case when the eigenvalue are μ_n with multiplicity r_n is traited. Our results extend and complete those established in [2].

This paper is organized as follows: We recall in section 2, the notions of approximate controllability, state and output stabilizability for infinite dimensional systems defined in Hilbert spaces.

In section 3, we give a generalization of the results presented in [2].

2 Preliminaries

We consider the system $(\mathcal{S})$ augmented by the output equation $(\mathcal{E})$ defined respectively by (1) and (2).

Definition 2.1 *We say that the system $(\mathcal{S})$(or the pair (A,B)) is approximately controllable if $\mathcal{N} = \{0\}$.*

Where $\mathcal{N} = \bigcap_{t\geq 0} \ker B^* S^* (t)$.

$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{N}^\perp$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are called, the controllable and uncontrollable subspaces of the system $(\mathcal{S})$, respectively.

According to [4], we can decompose the state space Z as $\mathcal{L} \oplus \mathcal{N}$ and then the system (1)-(2) can be written as:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x_1} = A_{11}x_1 + B_1 u \\ \dot{x_2} = A_{22}x_2 \\ y = y_1 + y_2 \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $y_i = C_i x_i$, for $i = 1, 2$.

Definition 2.2 *The system $(\mathcal{S})$ is said to be exponentially stabilizable if there is an $F \in L(Z,U)$ such that the semigroup $S_{A+BF}(t)$ is exponentially asymptotically stable.*

Where $S_{A+BF}(t)$ is the semigroup generated by $A + BF$.

Definition 2.3 *The system $(\mathcal{S})$ augmented by the output equation $(\mathcal{E})$ is output stabilizable by a bounded feedback if there is an $F \in L(Z,U)$ such that the output $y(t)$ of the closed system*

$$\dot{x}(t) = (A + BF)x(t),\ x(0) = x_0 \tag{12}$$

is exponentially stable, i.e., $y(t)$ converges to zero when $t \to \infty$, for every $x_0 \in Z$. See e.g.,[1],[3], [4].

3 Main Results

We need the following lemmas in the proof of our proposition.

Lemma 3.1 *The uncontrollable subspace $\mathcal{N}$ of the system (3)-(7) is of the following form*

$$\mathcal{N} = \overline{span}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{r_n}\alpha_j\varphi_{nj} \ / B_n^* v = 0,\ v = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{r_n})^T\right\} \tag{13}$$

where $B_n = (\langle g_i, \varphi_{nj}\rangle_{L^2(\Omega_i)})$, $1 \le i \le p$, $1 \le j \le r_n$ and $\overline{span}\{e_m,\ m \in I\}$ denotes the closed subspace generated by the vectors e_m, $m \in I$, T means transpose.

Proof: As in the proof of Lemma 3.2 in [2], we have $B^*S^*(t)\,x = 0$ if and only if

$$\langle E(\mu_n)x, g_i\rangle = 0, for\ all\ n \ge 1,\ i = 1, .., p \tag{14}$$

where

$$E(\mu_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{r_n}\langle ., \varphi_{nj}\rangle\varphi_{nj} \tag{15}$$

Noting that it is easy to see that

$$J = \{n \ / \ rank B_n < r_n\} = \left\{n \ / \ \ker\ B_n^* \neq \{0\}\right\}. \tag{16}$$

Let $x \in E(\mu_{n_0})\mathcal{N}$, $x \neq 0$, for a certain $n_0 \in J$. Then

$$B_{n_0}^* v_{n_0} = 0, \tag{17}$$

with $v_{n_0} = \left(\langle x,\ \varphi_{n_0 1}\rangle, ..., \langle x,\ \varphi_{n_0 r_{n_0}}\rangle\right)^T \neq 0$.

This shows that

$$\mathcal{N} \subset \overline{span}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{r_n}\alpha_j\varphi_{nj}\ , B_n^* v = 0,\ v = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{r_n})^T\right\}$$

The remaining part of the proof is easy to establish and will be omitted here.

From the previous Lemma we deduce the following consequence

Lemma 3.2 *The controllable subspace $\mathcal{L}$ of the system (3)-(7) is given by*

$$\mathcal{L} = \overline{span}\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{r_n}\alpha_j\varphi_{nj} \ / (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{r_n})^T \in Im B_n\right\} \tag{18}$$

where $B_n = (\langle g_i, \varphi_{nj}\rangle_{L^2(\Omega_i)})$, $1 \le i \le p$, $1 \le j \le r_n$.

We are now in position to prove the main result of this section

Proposition 3.3 *Suppose there are p actuators* $(\Omega_i, g_i)_{1\leq i\leq p}$ *and q sensors* $(D_i, f_i)_{1\leq i\leq q}$, *then the system (3)-(7) is output stabilizable if and only if*

$$\mu_n < 0, \ for\ all\ n\ in\ K \tag{19}$$

where

$$K = \{n/\ ImT_n \neq \{0\}\ \ and\ \ker B_n^* \neq \{0\}\} \tag{20}$$

and $B_n = (\langle g_i, \varphi_{nj}\rangle_{L^2(\Omega_i)}), T_n = (\langle f_k, \varphi_{nj}\rangle_{L^2(D_k)}), 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq r_n\ , 1 \leq k \leq q.$

Proof: Similar to the proof of Proposition 3.4 in [2], it suffices to study the stability of the output y_2 on the observable subspace $\mathcal{W}$ of the subsystem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \dot{x}_2^1 = A_{22}^1 x_2^1 \\ \dot{x}_2^2 = A_{22}^2 x_2^2 \\ y_2 \ = C_2^2 x_2^2 \end{array} \right. \tag{21}$$

where

$$A_{22} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} A_{22}^1 & 0 \\ 0 & A_{22}^2 \end{array} \right), C_2 = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 0 & C_2^2 \end{array} \right], \tag{22}$$

$$x_{02} = \left[\begin{array}{c} x_{02}^1 \\ x_{02}^2 \end{array} \right] \in \mathcal{M} \oplus \mathcal{W},\ \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{M}^{\perp},\ x_2(0) = x_{02},\ x_0 = \left[\begin{array}{c} x_{01} \\ x_{02} \end{array} \right] \in \mathcal{L} \oplus \mathcal{N}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W} = \overline{span} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{r_n} \alpha_j \varphi_{nj}\ ; v = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{r_n})^T \in \widetilde{\mathcal{V}} \right\} \tag{23}$$

with $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}} = ImT_n \cap \ker\ B_n^*$.

The output y_2 of the subsystem (21) is given by

$$y_2(t) = \left[\begin{array}{c} \sum\limits_{n\in K} \exp(\mu_n t) \sum\limits_{j=1}^{r_n} \langle x_0,\ \varphi_{nj}\rangle \langle\ f_1, \varphi_{nj}\rangle \\ . \\ . \\ . \\ \sum\limits_{n\in K} \exp(\mu_n t) \sum\limits_{j=1}^{r_n} \langle x_0,\ \varphi_{nj}\rangle \langle\ f_q, \varphi_{nj}\rangle \end{array} \right] \tag{24}$$

where

$$K = \left\{n/\ ImT_n \neq \{0\}\ \text{and}\ \ker B_n^* \neq \{0\}\right\}, \tag{25}$$

The sufficient condition is straightforward. Now we shall prove the converse. Suppose that the output $y_2(t)$ is exponentially stable but for a certain $n_0 \in K$, $\mu_{n_0} \geq 0$, then there are positive M and ω such that

$$\| y_2(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^q} \leq M \exp(-\omega t) \| x_0\| \quad \text{for every } x_0 \in Z \tag{26}$$

Set $x_0 = \varphi_{n_0 j}$ in equation (26) where $j \in \{1, ..., r_{n_0}\}$ (j fixed arbitrary) Then we obtain

$$\left|\langle f_k, \varphi_{n_0 j}\rangle\right| \leq M \exp\left\{-(\omega + \mu_{n_0})t\right\} \text{ for all } t \geq 0,\ k = 1, ..., q. \tag{27}$$

Thus $ImT_{n_0} = \{0\}$ and this contradicts the assumption that $n_0 \in K$.

Remark 3.4 *It is noteworthy that if* $p \geq \sup_n r_n$ *and rank* $B_n = r_n$*, for all* n*, then the approximate controllability is achieved and by virtue of Theorem 7.2 in [3], the system (3)-(7) is output stabilizable.*

References

[1] A.V. Balakrishnan, *Applied Functional Analysis,* Springer-Verlag, Second Edition, Berlin, 1981.

[2] F. Haddouchi, On the Output Stabilizability of the Diffusion Equation, Applied Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 4, no. 31, (2010), 1527 - 1534.

[3] R. Triggiani, On the Stabilizability Problem in Banach Space, J. Math. Anal. Appl., **52** (1975), 383-403.

[4] R. Rabah, D. Ionescu, Stabilization Problem in Hilbert Spaces, Int. J. Control., Vol. 46, no. 6, (1987), 2035-2042.